

Appl. No. 10/076,330
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 4 April 2006

Page 11 of 14
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

JUL 03 2006

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 17-18 are newly added

The applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority documents, and for indicating that the drawings are acceptable.

The claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label numbers, and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. The intended scope of each claim is not narrowed and no new matter is added.

New dependent claims are added to at least partially restore the original range of claims that existed before multiple dependencies were removed in the preliminary amendment. No new matter is added.

The Office action rejects claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Rosengren et al. (USP 5,633,683, hereinafter Rosengren). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1 claims a video transmission system that includes a first encoder that provides a plurality of coded video signals, a second encoder that provides a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals, a combiner that associates a descriptor that characterizes each corresponding input video signal to each coded sub-sampled video signal, and a multiplexer that multiplexes the plurality of coded video signals with the plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals associated with their descriptors to provide the output video signal such that each coded video signal and each coded sub-sampled video signal is independently accessible in the output video signal.

In like manner, claim 2 claims a video transmission system that includes an encoder that provides a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals, and claims 11 and 12 claim a video transmission method that includes supplying a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals.

Appl. No. 10/076,330
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 4 April 2006

Page 12 of 14

Rosengren fails to teach an encoder that provides a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals. Rosengren teaches creating a mosaic of sub-sampled video signals, and then encoding the mosaic to provide a single encoding of the mosaic. Because of this single encoding of the entire mosaic, the entire mosaic must be decoded to access any of the sub-sampled video signals.

Because Rosengren fails to teach an encoder that provides a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-2 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Rosengren.

Claim 3, upon which claims 4-9 and 17-18 depend, claims a video processing system that includes a demultiplexer that demultiplexes an input video signal to provide a plurality of coded video signals and a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals, a database that stores data descriptors corresponding to each coded sub-sampled video signal, and an image compositor that creates a mosaic from a select group of sub-sampled video signals selected from the plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals based on a user request and the data descriptors.

In like manner, claim 13 teaches a video processing method that includes generating a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals from an input video signal, creating a database to store data descriptors and creating a mosaic from a select group of sub-sampled video signals selected from the plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals based on the data descriptors and a user request.

Rosengren does not teach demultiplexing an input video signal to provide a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals, and does not teach creating a mosaic from a select group of sub-sampled video signals selected from the plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals.

As noted above, Rosengren teaches creating the mosaic at the transmitter, and transmitting a single encoding of the entire mosaic. Consequently, Rosengren's demultiplexer provides a plurality of coded video signals and a single coded mosaic

Appl. No. 10/076,330
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 4 April 2006

Page 13 of 14

signal. Because the mosaic is sent from the transmitter, it is predefined when it is received, and Rosengren does not teach creating a mosaic based on a user request.

Because Rosengren does not teach demultiplexing an input video signal to provide a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals, and does not teach creating a mosaic from a select group of sub-sampled video signals selected from the plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals based on a user request, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3-5, 7-9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Rosengren.

The Office action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rosengren and Dureau et al. (USP 6,539,545, hereinafter Dureau). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 6 is dependent upon claim 3, and the Office action relies upon Rosengren for teaching the elements of claim 3 in this rejection.

Because Rosengren does not teach demultiplexing an input video signal to provide a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals, and does not teach creating a mosaic from a select group of sub-sampled video signals selected from the plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals based on a user request, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rosengren and Dureau.

The Office action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rosengren and Ito et al. (USP 6,377,309, hereinafter Ito).

Claim 10 claims a digital signal that includes a plurality of primary video signals coded in accordance with an MPEG-2 standard, a plurality of secondary video signals coded in accordance with an MPEG-4 standard, each secondary video signal being obtained successively by sub-sampling and encoding each primary video signal, and a descriptor corresponding to each secondary signal characterizing the corresponding primary video signal.

The Office action relies upon Rosengren for teaching all of the elements of

Appl. No. 10/076,330
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 4 April 2006

Page 14 of 14

claim 10 except the combination of MPEG-2 and MPEG-4 encodings, and Ito for teaching a combination of MPEG-2 and MPEG-4 encodings.

As noted above, Rosengren fails to teach or suggest a signal that includes a plurality of coded secondary video signals, and Ito fails to cure this deficiency. As such, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rosengren and Ito.

The Office action rejects claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rosengren. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 14-16 are dependent upon claims 11-13, respectively. Claims 11-13 are discussed above with regard to Rosengren.

Because Rosengren fails to teach encoding or demultiplexing a plurality of coded sub-sampled video signals, as claimed in claims 11-13, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rosengren.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Attorney
Registration Number 41,508
patents@lawyer.com

1824 Federal Farm Road
Montross, VA 22520
Phone: 804-493-0707
Fax: 215-243-7525